

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

CLAYTON TANKSLEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,
Acting Commissioner of Social
Security,
Defendant.

:
: **CIVIL ACTION**
:
:
: **No. 14-05751**
:
:
:
:
:

ORDER

AND NOW, this 18th day of June, 2015, upon consideration of the Plaintiff's Request for Review and the Defendant's response thereto, and after careful review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Jacob P. Hart (Doc. No. 13) and all responses thereto, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:¹

1. The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;
2. The plaintiff's Request for Review is **DENIED**; and
3. Judgment is entered in this case in favor of the defendant.

BY THE COURT:

/s/Lawrence F. Stengel

LAWRENCE F. STENGEL, J.

¹ The plaintiff filed objections to Judge Hart's Report and Recommendation. He argues that the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) reliance on the vocational testimony provided at the hearing was improper based on several agency rulings and regulations. These are the same arguments he made in his Request for Review to which the Government responded. Judge Hart adequately addressed these arguments. The plaintiff again raises the same arguments in his objections. As Judge Hart explained and the Government argued in its responses, the plaintiff misreads the applicable regulations and misconstrues the vocational witness's testimony; the ALJ complied with the appropriate regulations. The plaintiff's objections are without merit.